Edmonton Area Series Report No. 28

RURAL-URBAN ORIGINS AND FEAR OF CRIME: THE CASE FOR 'RURAL BAGGAGE'

By

Leslie W. Kennedy

and

Harvey Krahn

Department of Sociology
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 2H4

The 1981 Edmonton Area Study was administered and supported by the Population Research Laboratory and the Department of Sociology at The University of Alberta. This year's study was directed by L.W. Kennedy. In close cooperation with Dr. L.W. Kennedy, Raymond Currie of the Department of Sociology, University of Manitoba, and Charlene Thacker of the Department of Sociology, University of Winnipeg conducted a 1981 Winnipeg Area Study.

July 1983

ABSTRACT

Studies comparing the fear of crime of residents of different sized communities have considered only one dimension of the relationship between urban life and fear of crime. This paper extends previous research by examining the effects of rural-urban origin, using survey data from two large western Canadian cities. The identification of important interaction effects between size of place of origin and length of residence in the city, gender, and age allows discussion of how "rural baggage" may influence current city residents' subjective responses to the urban environment.

Introduction

There has been an increased interest in recent years in the determinants of the fear of crime. This research has concentrated on isolating the factors which are important in creating this fear. Included in this are individual characteristics such as being a victim (Garafolo, 1979; Gubrium, 1974; Hindelang, et al, 1978), female (Markson and Hess, 1980; Riger, et al., 1982; Lee, 1982), elderly (Clemente and Kleiman, 1976; Sundeen, 1977), and poor (U.S. Department of Justice, 1977) . The surrounding environment can also play a role in raising fear levels. Skogan and Maxfield (1980) talk about urban decline and social incivility in neighborhoods raising individual levels of fear. This can increase with social isolation, either because of age or family status (Kennedy and Silverman, 1983; Riger, et al., 1981).

Generally, the urban experience is believed to be somewhat frightening. There are higher rates of crime in urban areas than there are in rural areas (Lee, 1982:656). Therefore, it is argued, people have greater reason to fear crime. This may be a function of media discussion of crime (Sacco, 1982), as well as of a general concern about victimization (Garafolo, 1978). However, the evidence on this point is not entirely conclusive. While some researchers report that people believe that rural areas are much safer than are urban ones (Conklin, 1975:134), other researchers such as Lee (1982) have discovered contrary

evidence. Lee reports that fear, in fact, is as high in rural areas as in urban areas. Boggs (1971), in the same vein, argues that although urban dwellers have higher levels of fear, rural residents rate their chances of being victimized higher than do city residents. Hartnagel(1979) reports further, in analysis of data comparable to that examined in this study (i.e. drawn from one of the cities using a similar sampling procedure), that victimization does not affect the relationship between neighbourhood affect and fear. Similarly, the relationship between rates of crime and fear is complex. Although it is tempting to link the two, the research findings indicate that risk of victimization and fear are not necessarily related, especially among groups such as the elderly where victimization is low while fear is high (Baumer, 1978; Braungart et al., 1980).

There is an alternative way of looking at this problem. From this point of view, fear in urban areas results from a general alienating influence on the individual. There is a lessening of trust, a breakdown of community support and a greater incidence of strangers in urban environments than in rural ones. This point of view has been a source of much contention in the urban research literature over the years. Wirth (1938), Simmel(1957) , and others argued strongly that the move to cities brought about a loss of normative adjustment. In arguing against this point of view, Gans(1970) points out that subcultures develop to provide the individual resident with a means of buffering the direct

effects of urban life, thereby lessening stress and providing social and emotional support (Gans,1970:72).

The debate about structural effects of urban life and urban personality has been advanced in Fischer's research on the "public" versus "private" life of cities. Fischer studied the relationship between city size and the fear of crime. He claims that as urbanism increases, so too does distrust of "most people" in the town and city. This results, then, in increasing the fear of crime.(Fischer, 1981:315). There is an apparent contradiction here, however, which sees Fischer arguing on the one hand that cities have no structural effects on the personality of individuals as they are able to benefit from strong levels of social support as would people living in rural areas. On the other hand, he finds that there are high levels of fear and distrust in urban residents that are not apparent in the rural group. These findings are in contrast to those reported above where no association between fear and community size appeared.

Fischer explains his findings by arguing that urban life estranges public relations. It is in the public area that fear of crime is most evident. Fear of crime is most often fear of the stranger and strangers are more evident in cities (Merry, 1980; Skogan and Maxfield,1980). So there is, in Fischer's terms, simply more opportunity to come into contact with people one does not know. Private relations, meanwhile, remain unaffected by urban life. While Fischer's

work may have helped to resolve the problems of private relations in adjusting to urban environments, they leave unresolved the nature of public relations, specifically as they relate to the influence of urban environments on fear of crime.

We accept that higher crime rates in larger urban centers could positively affect fear of crime. However, few researchers have considered the "alienating city" explanation of greater fear in larger cities. Korte (1980:38) points out that little attention has been paid to the question of urban versus nonurban "background" as a predictor of social behavior. He laments the fact that there have been no studies to date comparing social behavior towards strangers in an urban environment by persons from urban versus non-urban areas. "One would have to conclude from the very small amount of evidence that is available that there is only very limited support for the idea that a person's urban versus nonurban background is correlated with present patterns of social behavior" (Korte, 1980:39). Thus, Korte's work focuses specifically on the issue raised above, that is, the "urban personality" concept. This concept suggests that one's socialization locale can affect one's attitudes and behavior. Migrants from rural areas may arrive in the city with "rural baggage". Thus, the urban personality may be a function of rural versus urban residence in formative years. Alternatively, urban personality may be determined by current experience, an

assumption that is implicitly made by Fischer in his testing of differences between urban, suburban, and rural samples.

There is some usefulness in going beyond the comparison across locations and testing for the adjustment that people make to public relations based on differences in their backgrounds alone. By holding structural effects (e.g. city size) constant we can more clearly address the issue of urban life versus "rural baggage" effects on fear. In this way we can deal with the issue left unaddressed by Fischer, that is, what are the effects of rural-urban background on the response to crime of individuals currently living in a large city environment? We begin with a pair of competing hypotheses.

First, people with "rural baggage" might be less alienated, more self-confident, and have a greater tendency to trust others. They would, therefore, experience less fear of crime. Then, as they became more socialized to the urban environment through having lived there longer, fear of crime should increase. Alternatively, those with rural baggage might fear more since they would be unaccustomed to the urban milieu and more distrustful of strangers. We would expect, by this logic, that with time in the city this alienation would reduce and fear of crime would diminish. These hypotheses are simply predictions of statistical interaction between rural-urban background and length of residence in the city. Rural-urban background may also interact with other predictors of fear of crime (e.g. age

and sex). Our analysis becomes more exploratory as we consider this possibility.

Part of the importance of this research lies in the reformulation of the urban-rural question. Considering only the current place of residence as an important causal variable might be appropriate in a society of non-migrants. However, both Canada and the U.S.A. have experienced extensive rural-to-urban migration in the past generations. Consequently, a failure to consider the effects of rural versus urban socialization on present attitudes and behaviours is a failure to fully explore the rural-urban question. A second contribution made by this study is the broadening of the examination of the correlates of fear of crime. Most research in this area has considered only additive effects of individual and place of residence characteristics. We go beyond this to examine the manner in which urban or rural residence when growing up conditions the effects of such predictor variables.

The Study

The data reported here were collected in two concurrent studies conducted in the western Canadian cities of Winnipeg and Edmonton. The 1981 Edmonton Area Study was the fifth in an annual series administered and supported by the Population Research Laboratory at the University of Alberta. The Winnipeg Area Study was administered by members of the departments of Sociology at the Universities of Manitoba and

Winnipeg. The two studies employed the same questionnaire in one hour structured interviews with a randomly selected sample of residents of both cities in February, 1981. Recent municipal records were used to generate simple random samples of household addresses in both cities. In family households chosen, either the husband or wife was eligible for interviewing. In non-family households (i.e. any person or group of non-related persons occupying a dwelling) any member over 18 years of age was eligible. Because of a concern that women would be more likely to be home and thus would be oversampled, interviewers were instructed to try to obtain an equal number of male and female respondents by requesting to speak to a male in the first contact until a sufficient number were included.[1] The final samples of 400 in Edmonton and 336 in Winnipeg represented response rates of 75% and 74%, respectively. The samples provide us with a detailed cross-section of the population of the cities, and allow comparisons of people living in a variety of locations and different environments.

Measurement and Method

The dependent variable, fear of crime, is measured through a question asking: "How safe do you feel walking alone in your neighbourhood at night?" The percentage

---

[1]In Edmonton the final sample was 51.5% female and 48.5% male, while in Winnipeg, 59% of the respondents were female and 41% were male. In comparisons to the 1976 census, the samples were judged to be accurate on this and other demographic characteristics.

distribution of responses to the question is: (1) very unsafe (6.3%), (2) unsafe (13.8%),(3) neutral (unlabelled) response (19.4%), (4) safe (33.1%), and (5) very safe (27.4%). With scores of 1 to 5 assigned to these response categories, this distribution has a mean of 3.62 with a standard deviation of 1.20 (n = 718). This measure has been the most widely used in previous research on fear of crime (see Yin, 1980 for a review). It identifies a behavioral response to a feeling of vulnerability to victimization. This question is appropriate for this analysis as it focuses attention on the role that changing social and physical aspects of the neighborhood have on responses to crime.

The effect of size of the community of origin was measured with a fixed response question about the place where the respondent had spent most of his or her time when growing up. Respondents who had lived in one community all of their lives did not answer the question. For these cases (52 in Edmonton and 88 in Winnipeg), the category score representing the size their city would have been when they were growing up was assigned (e.g. a 50 year old resident of Edmonton would have grown up when the city had a population of less than 100,000). The resulting distribution was: rural (20.9%), rural non-farm (2.3%), less than 1000 (9.6%), less than 10,000 (11.6%), less than 50,000 (7.0%), less than 100,000 (4.9%), less than 500,000 (29.8%), and more than 500,000 (13.8%). With scores of 1 to 8 assigned to these categories, the variable's mean was 4.85 with a standard

deviation of 2.55 (n = 731).

The growing research literature on the determinants of fear of crime has identified a number of other important factors. The independent variables used to predict variations in fear of crime in this study include demographic characteristics of individuals. Gender has been shown to have major effects on fear (Clemente and Kleiman, 1976; Lebowitz, 1975; Markson and Hess, 1980), with women fearing crime more than men. Clemente and Kleiman (1976) report that socio-economic status is inversely related to fear. We use measures of household income (47 categories) and binary variables for employment status (full-time = 1; other = 0), clerical/sales/service occupations (yes = 1; other = 0), and blue collar occupations (yes = 1; other = 0). Education is measured by total number of years of schooling. We include , as well, a measure of marital status (married/ common law = 1; other = 0). In addition, many researchers report that as age increases, so does fear (Hindelang et al., 1978; Lebowitz, 1975). We employ a measure of age in single year categories.

Other independent variables include those related to the physical environment in which people live. We include binary measures of tenure status (own = 1, other = 0); residence in a single dwelling (yes = 1, no = 0);and residence in an apartment (yes = 1, no = 0). We also add length of residence in the current dwelling (measured in years) to our measure of years in the city. Finally, we

include an indicator of city of current residence (Edmonton = 1, Winnipeg = 0). [2]

Findings

The zero-order correlation between fear of crime and size of place of origin is .072 (n = 714). Although statistically significant ($p < .05$), the association is very weak: size of place of origin accounts for less than 1% of the variation in fear of crime in this sample. Nevertheless, the sign of the correlation does allow us to reject one of the two simple hypotheses we presented. People with "rural baggage", i.e. those who grew up in smaller communities, are less likely to feel safe in the big city neighbourhood in which they now live. Survey respondents who grew up in larger cities (including those who still live in the large city in which they were born) feel safer. There is no support for the hypothesis that rural migrants to the city are better adjusted and, hence, less frightened of crime.

Do current city residents who grew up in large communities have a permanent "advantage" in this respect over migrants from smaller centres and rural areas, or does

---

[2]Other variables examined and found to have very weak associations with fear of crime were: number of children in the household, length of residence in the community of origin, religiosity, amount of contact with neighbours, friends, and relatives, measures of satisfaction with friendships and life in general, amount of help (in various forms) from relatives, indices of positive affect, of negative affect, of reported depression, and of lonliness, a dummy variable for professional/managerial occupation, and a second binary variable for duplex/rowhouse type of residence.

the difference disappear with length of residence in the city? For the sixty-one respondents who had lived in their city for two years or less, the correlation between size of place of origin and fear of crime was .328. The correlation between these two variables among the remaining 643 sample members (longer than two years of residence in the city) is much smaller ($r = .053$). Obviously age is a confounding factor in such an analysis since older people typically report more fear of crime, and older people would be more likely to have grown up in smaller communities. However, when the partial correlations between size of place of origin and fear of crime (controlling on age) are compared, the pattern remains the same. The partial correlation for those with less than two years of residence is .306 ($p < .05$), but the association disappears for the larger sub-sample of longer term residents (partial $r = -.004$). Among recent migrants to these two large cities, the size of the community in which they grew up accounts for 9% of the variation in reported feelings of safety in their neighbourhood. But this direct effect is short-lived. After about two years, the difference between the fear of crime of individuals with different socialization locales disappears.[3]

---

[3]The relationship between size of community of origin and fear of crime was examined within six categories of "5 years in the city" width. The partial correlations, controlling on age, ranged between -.03 and .10 and none were statistically significant.

The additional zero-order associations reported in Table 1 are congruent with those identified in previous research. Men are more likely to report feeling safe (r = .454) as are married respondents (r = .111). Older people feel less safe (r = -.176), which also explains why those who have lived longer in the city (r = -.152) and in their current residence (r = -.128) feel less safe. The city itself (Winnipeg or Edmonton) is unrelated to fear of crime. Homeowners feel safer (r = .158) probably because they frequently live in single dwellings which are associated with reports of less fear of crime (r = .151). Apartment dwellers are likely to report feeling less safe (r = -.131). Since the fear of crime indicator asks about feeling safe in the neighbourhood, these housing type measures are probably indexing different neighbourhood characteristics. Home ownership and single dwelling status also indirectly index social status and access to resources which can reduce fear of crime. Other more direct measures of social status allow the same conclusion. Reported feelings of safety covary positively with years of education (r = .141) and total household income (r = .265). The correlation between the dependent variable and full-time employment (r = .212), blue collar occupational status (r = .243), and clerical/sales/services occupation (r = -.199) are probably partial products of the association between gender and fear of crime.

Table 1: Zero-Order Correlations, Means and Standard Deviations

	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	$\bar{X}$	S	
(1) Fear of Crime	.072	.001	-.152	-.128	.158	.151	-.131	.454	-.176	.111	.141	.265	.212	-.199	.245	.137	-.009	3.62	1.20	(1)
(2) Size of place of origin		-.065	.099	-.137	-.108	-.035	-.022	.088	-.295	.065	.189	.090	.098	.029	-.055	-.078	-.009	4.85	2.56	(2)
(3) City (Edmonton = 1)			-.271	-.126	-.061	-.031	-.011	.077	-.102	.065	.084	.153	.058	-.017	.043	.018	-.029	0.54	0.49	(3)
(4) Length of residence in city (years)				.574	.275	.259	-.182	-.080	.586	.028	-.218	-.118	-.197	.109	-.080	.099	.016	21.94	16.65	(4)
(5) Length of residence in dwelling (years)					.455	.411	-.331	-.071	.583	.074	-.174	-.016	-.200	.046	-.049	.145	.050	7.71	8.78	(5)
(6) Home ownership (yes = 1)						.708	-.654	.039	.332	.336	-.040	.310	-.057	-.030	.014	.225	.129	0.60	0.49	(6)
(7) Single dwelling (yes = 1)							-.722	.037	.216	.317	.026	.330	-.075	-.059	.018	.234	.119	0.62	0.48	(7)
(8) Apartment (yes = 1)								-.027	-.166	-.340	.029	-.331	.035	.079	-.044	-.138	-.140	0.24	0.49	(8)
(9) Gender (male = 1)									-.037	.150	.056	.209	.361	-.334	.454	-.047	-.045	0.45	0.50	(9)
(10) Age (years)										.056	-.394	-.210	-.300	.050	-.025	.210	.033	41.47	16.89	(10)
(11) Marital status (married/common law = 1)											.038	.364	-.019	-.070	.043	.093	.286	0.62	0.48	(11)
(12) Education (total number of years)												.362	.232	-.183	-.239	-.031	.027	12.42	3.54	(12)
(13) Household income (47 categories)													.296	-.180	.034	.080	.081	22.28	14.21	(13)
(14) Employment status (full-time = 1)														-.108	.138	-.026	-.012	0.53	0.50	(14)
(15) Clerical/sales/services occupation (yes = 1)															-.454	.019	.040	0.38	0.48	(15)
(16) Blue collar occupation (yes = 1)																-.061	-.044	0.26	0.44	(16)
(17) Neighbourhood Satisfaction																	.122	5.67	1.44	(17)
(18) Family life satisfaction																	-	6.00	1.27	(18)

*Sample sizes for correlation with the dependent variable ranged between 709 and 718, except for the correlation with total household income (n = 634)

These independent variables were employed in a series of step-wise multiple regression analyses, resulting in the three reduced form multiple regression equations displayed in Table 2. The same independent variables are used to predict fear of crime for the total sample, and then for sub-samples of respondents who grew up in smaller and in larger communities. Variables were dropped from the large list of possible predictors if they did not have significant net effects in at least one of the three equations.

Two general questions guided the analysis: (1) Does size of place of origin continue to have a significant effect on fear of crime after controlling on other relevant variables? The small zero-order association might remain the same or decrease, or it could increase because of suppressor effects. (2) Are the effects on fear of crime of other independent variables conditioned by the size of place of origin measure? Such potential interactions between this variable and other predictors can be best examined by using size of socialization locale as a covariate. [4]

Considering the total sample equation first (n = 626), we note that size of place of residence is not among the

---

[4]Alternative cutting points for the covariate - size of place of origin - were also considered. However, splitting the sample into four categories (rural, small town, small city, and large city) or into three (communities of less than 1000, of 1000 to 50,000, and of more than 50,000) did not reveal any additional useful information. The loss of around 100 cases in total is due primarily to missing data on the income variable. Recalculation of these equations with income omitted resulted in a lower amount of explained variance but no important changes in the effects of other variables.

Table 2: Determinants of Fear of Crime: Reduced-form Multiple Regression Equations[+] by Size of Place of Origin

Independent Variable	Size of Place of Origin		
	<50,000	≥50,000	Total
Gender (male=1)	.895*	1.888*	1.067*
	(.126)##	(.109)	(.082)
	[.360]	[.512]	[.444]
Age (years)	-.022*	-.002	-.013*
	(.006)##	(.005)	(.003)
	[-.302]	[-.027]	[-.180]
Household Income (47 categories)	.010*	.005	.008*
	(.005)	(.004)	(.003)
	[.117]	[.055]	[.088]
Homeowner (yes=1)	.391*	.327*	.385*
	(.146)	(.128)	(.096)
	[.154]	[.140]	[.158]
Neighbourhood Satisfaction	.115*	.114*	.106*
	(.049)	(.036)	(.029)
	[.124]	[.147]	[.125]
Family Satisfaction	-.132*	-.007	-.064
	(.053)#	(.040)	(.033)
	[-.123]	[-.007]	[-.066]
City (Edmonton=1)	.007	-.257*	-.141
	(.126)	(.115)	(.084)
	[.003]	[-.111]	[-.059]
Length of Residence in the City (years)	.001	-.012	-.006
	(.001)	(.004)	(.003)
	[.010]	[-.183]	[-.078]
Constant	3.754	2.720	3.240
Adjusted R^2 =	.275	.361	.310
N =	307	315	626

[+] In each cell in this table, the first entry is the unstandardized regression coefficient (b), the second is the standard error of the coefficient (S.e.) and the third is the standardized regression coefficient (Beta).

* Regression coefficient is significantly different from zero ($p < .05$).

The difference between regression coefficients for the same variable in the small community and large community equation is statistically significant ($p < .10$), using a two-tailed t-test employing $\sqrt{S.e._1^2 + S.e._2^2}$ to calculate the standard error of differences between coefficients. (Adapted from Pfeffer, et.al., 1982).

The difference between regression coefficients is significant at the .05 level.

eight independent variables which account for a substantial 31% of the variation in fear of crime. Thus, this variable of interest does not appear to have any net additive effects on fear of crime. Furthermore, neither the current city of residence or the length of time the respondent had lived there have statistically significant regression coefficients. The largest net effect is that of gender. Men are more likely to report feeling safe in their neighbourhood (Beta = .444). Older respondents are less likely to feel safe (Beta = -.180), controlling on other variables in the equation. Other variables with significant positive effects in this total sample equation are household income (Beta = .088), home ownership (Beta = .158), and neighbourhood satisfaction (Beta = .125). Wealthier individuals and those who are more satisfied with their neighbourhood typically feel safer. These results replicate the findings of other studies. They do not inform us about the effects of "rural baggage" on fear of crime.

The equations for those who grew up in rural areas or smaller communities (n = 307) and for those who grew up in larger cities (n = 315) account for 28% and 36% of the variation in fear of crime, respectively. Comparison of relative effects within equations shows that gender is the strongest predictor in each sub-sample (Betas of .300 and .512). Home ownership is a significant predictor of moderate strength in each sub-sample (Betas of .154 and .140) as is neighbourhood satisfaction (Betas of .124 and .147).

However, there are also some substantial differences between the two regression equations. Our question about the conditioning influence of size of place of origin on the effects of other independent variables requires a comparison of slopes (unstandardized regression coefficients) across these two sub-samples.

The most substantial conditioning effect of size of place of origin is on the relationship between gender and reported feelings of safety. Men feel more safe walking alone in their neighbourhood at night, and women feel less safe. But, controlling on other important variables, we find that the difference between men and women is signficantly larger among individuals who grew up in larger communities. The slope for those who grew up in larger communities (b = 1.888) is more than twice the size of the slope for the other sub-sample (b = .895). This may mean that women with urban backgrounds are more conscious than are women with rural backgrounds of dangers they might face walking alone in their neighbourhood at night. Thus when comparing men and women with similar backgrounds, we find a larger difference across sexes in feelings of safety within the urban sub-sample. This explanation focuses on women, but these results might also reflect differences between men of different backgrounds. Thus, men with "rural baggage" may feel less safe than do men with urban socialization, while differences across background among women may be less important. Such general questions force us to examine the

differences between means (Table 3) which show more support for the second explanation. Women with rural or urban backgrounds report similar level feelings of safety (average score of 54 and 53 out of 100, respectively). However, the big difference is between rural and urban men. The latter feel considerably safer (an average score of 84 out of 100 compared to 77).[5]

Returning to Table 2, we find older individuals are generally more likely to report fear of crime, but this is mainly due to the higher fear of crime of older respondents from rural backgrounds. Older people who grew up in larger cities are <u>not</u> more likely to feel unsafe than are younger residents with a similar background. The net effect of age on fear of crime in the rural origin sample (b = -.022) is much larger than is the net effect of age in the urban origin group (b = -.002), [6] and the difference between the slopes is statistically significant. We can again investigate the differences between means for age groups by looking at Table 3. We find that older residents of urban origins feel safer than older residents of rural origins (scores of 54 and 47 out of 100, respectively), even though

---

[5]The difference in the effect of gender on fear of crime, across size of place of origin categories in Table 2 appears larger because the effects of other variables are being controlled. Similar controls could be introduced in Table 3 but these unadjusted means present the picture more clearly.

[6]We cannot argue that the effects of age on fear of crime in this urban equation are reduced because of the inclusion of length of residence as a control variable. The two variables are strongly correlated in this sub-sample (r = .632) but the zero-order association between age and feelings of safety in the neighbourhood is only -.035.

Table 3: Fear of Crime by Size of Place of Origin

by Age and Gender

	<50,000			≥50,000		
	$\bar{X}$	X/100[a]	n	$\bar{X}$	X/100[a]	n
Age (years)						
<35	3.78	70	(129)	3.68	67	(193)
35-44	3.64	66	(75)	3.95	74	(56)
45-64	3.55	64	(100)	3.77	69	(77)
>65	2.88	47	(60)	3.14	54[b]	(22)
Gender						
Female	3.15	54	(209)	3.10	53	(178)
Male	4.07	77	(156)	4.34	84	(171)
Total	3.54	64	(365)	3.70	68	(349)

[a] This 0-100 scale is a direct transformation of the mean, calculated by subtracting 1 from the mean and dividing by 4 (since the original scale had possible values of 1 to 5).

[b] This deviation from linearity is statistically significant (p=.02). Using this four category measure of age, the correlation coefficient with the "feelings of safety" measure is -.038 while eta=.15.

within both groups, younger people feel safer than do older respondents. The young/old difference, however, is larger in the rural group. In addition, there is a significant curvilinear effect in the urban sample which does not appear in the rural sample. Among those with "rural baggage", the older you get, the less safe you feel. Meanwhile, among those with urban backgrounds, feelings of safety increase into middle age and then decrease.

Looking again at Table 2 we find that family satisfaction has a negative and significant net effect on fear of crime in the small town/rural sample. Among these respondents, greater family satisfaction is associated with feeling less safe in the neighbourhood. The relationship is virtually non-existent among respondents who grew up in larger areas. Although the difference between the two slopes is not significant ($p < .10$), we might still speculate about its meaning. Among current city residents of rural origin, satisfaction with family life may lead to an increased focus on private (kinship) relations and a greater estrangement from the realm of public social relations which a "fear of crime" measure taps. Such a separation of private and public social relations may be less likely among individuals who have grown up in larger centres.

The binary measure representing city of current residence is included in these equations as a variable controlling on objective differences between cities. In the total sample equation, its net effect is not statistically

significant, although we note that Edmonton residents feel less safe than do Winnipeg residents. However, there is an interesting although non-significant difference across sub-samples in the net effect of city of residence on fear of crime. The slope is tiny and unimportant in the rural/small town equation (b = .007) but much larger and significantly different from zero in the urban equation (b = -.257). This might mean that, controlling on differences in age, income, gender and other important variables, people who grow up in larger urban areas are more discriminating in their assessment of neighbourhood safety. Among such urban socialized individuals, those living in Edmonton are less likely to feel safe in their neighbourhood than are those living in Winnipeg. The respondents with rural/small town socialization obviously live in one of these same two cities but do not evaluate them differently in terms of personal safety.

Summary and Discussion

Analysis of survey data from two large western Canadian cities revealed that, for new arrivals in a city, size of place of origin has a substantial effect on fear of crime, but this effect is short-lived. Among short-term (less than two years) residents, the larger the community of origin, the safer the current big city resident feels. Among longer-term residents this association disappears. However, there are further more complex effects of "rural baggage" on

fear of crime.

A variety of other studies have reported the effects of gender on fear of crime: women feel less safe than do men. This study replicates this finding but also demonstrates that the effects of gender are twice as strong for those current city residents who grew up in urban areas as for those with a rural background. The explanation is that men with "rural baggage" feel less safe than do men with an urban background, while there is little difference in reported fear of crime for women from different socialization locales. This unexpected finding becomes a reminder that, recognizing greater fear of crime among women, we should also note the considerable variation in such fear among men.

These data also demonstrate an interesting interaction effect between age and size of community of origin. Examinations of the relationship between age and fear of crime, including this one, generally find an increase in fear with age. Going beyond this additive model, we find a strong linear effect of age on fear of crime among current city residents with "rural baggage", but a very weak and non-significant linear effect among survey respondents who grew up in a larger urban area. There exists, however, a significant curvilinear effect in the urban background sub-sample: feelings of safety increase into middle age but then decrease again, although not to the level reported by elderly respondents who grew up in rural areas. With the

increased urbanization of North American society, a larger proportion of individuals are today growing up in urban areas. Hence, in the future, we might expect to find a decrease in the association between age and fear of crime.

This study of fear of crime has attempted to broaden the debate about the effects of urban versus rural residence on individuals' life experiences. The analytic strategy involved focusing on the rural or urban setting in which an individual grew up, while holding constant the size of current city of residence. In demonstrating that size of place of origin is a variable which conditions the effects of other factors on individuals' fear of crime, we have also extended the fear of crime research literature beyond simple additive models Our intent in introducing the "rural baggage" concept to this research tradition is not to downplay the objective basis of city residents' fear of crime. Instead, we believe that this concept and these findings can add to our understanding of the fear which urban crime generates.

References

Baumer, T.L.
1978. "Research on Fear of Crime in the United States". *Victimology* 3,3/4:254-264.

Boggs, S.L.
1971. "Formal and Informal Crime Control: An Exploratory Study of Urban, Suburban, and Rural Orientations". *Sociological Quarterly* 12 (Summer):319-27.

Braungart, M., R. Braungart and W. Hoyt.
1980. "Age, Sex and Social Factors in Fear of Crime". *Sociological Focus*, 13:1, pp. 55-66.

Clemente, F. and M. Kleiman.
1976. "Fear of Crime Among the Aged". *The Gerontologist*, 16:3, pp. 207-210.

Conklin, John E.
1975. The Impact of Crime. N.Y.:Macmillan.

Fischer, C.
1981. "The Public and Private Worlds of City Life". *American Sociological Review*, V.46 (June):306-316.

Gans, H.
1970. "Urbanism and Suburbanism as Ways of Life: A Re-evaluation of Definitions" in Gutman, R. and D. Popenoe, Neighborhood, City and Metropolis. N.Y.:Random House:70-84.

Garafolo, J.
1979. "Victimization and Fear of Crime". *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, Jan., pp. 80-97.

Gubrium, J.
1974. "Victimization in Old Age: Available Evidence and Three Hypotheses". *Crime and Delinquency*, July, pp. 245-250.

Hartnagel, T.
1979. "The Perceptions and Fear of Crime: Implications for Neighborhood Cohesion, Social Activity, and Community Affect". *Social Forces*, Vol. 58 No. 1: 176-193.

Hindelang, M., M. Gottfredson and J. Garafolo.
1978. Victims of Personal Crime: An Empirical Foundation for a Theory of Personal Victimization. Ballinger, Cambridge, Mass.

Kennedy, L.W., and R.A. Silverman.
1983. "Significant Others and Fear of Crime in the Elderly". *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*. (forthcoming)

Korte, C.
1980. "Urban-Nonurban Differences in Social Behavior and Social Psychological Models of Urban Impact". *Journal of Social Issues*, V.36 No.3: 29-51.

Lebowitz, B.
1975. "Age and Fearfulness: Personal and Situational Factors". *Sociological Focus*, 13:1, pp. 696-700.

Lee, G.R.
1982. "Residential Location and Fear of Crime Among the Elderly". *Rural Sociology*, 47,4: 655-669.

Markson, E. and B. Hess.
1980. "Older Women in the City". *Signs*, 5:3, pp. 127-141, 1980.

Merry, S.
1980. Urban Danger. Philadelphia: Temple U.P.

Pfeffer, J. and J. Ross.
1982. "The Effects of Marriage and a Working Wife on Occupational and Wage Attainment". *Administrative Science Quarterly* 27:66-80.

Riger, S., Gordon, M.T. and R.K. LeBailly.
1982. "Coping with Urban Crime: Women's Use of Precautionary Behaviors". *American Journal of Community Psychology*, V.10 No.4:369-386.

Riger, S., R.K. LeBailly, and M.T. Gordon.
1981. "Community Ties and Urbanites' Fear of Crime: An Ecological Investigation". *American Journal of Community Psychology*, V.9 No.6:653-665.

Sacco, V.
1982. "The Effects of Mass Media On Perceptions of Crime". *Pacific Sociological Review*, V.25 No. 4:475-493.

Simmel, G.
1957. "The Metropolis and Mental Life" in Hait and Reiss (ed.), Cities and Society, N.Y.: The Free Press of Glencoe, rev. ed.:635-646.

Skogan, W. and M. Maxfield.
1980. Coping with Crime: Victimization, Fear and Reactions to Crime in Three American Cities. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Sundeen, R.
1977. "The Fear of Crime and Urban Elderly". *Justice and Older Americans*, M. Young Rifai, (ed.), Lexington Books, Toronto.

U.S. Department of Justice.
1977. Public Opinion About Crime: The Attitudes of Victims and Non-Victims in Selected Cities, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington.

Wirth, L.
1968. "Urbanism as a Way of Life", in Fava, S., Urbanism in World Perspective. N.Y.: Crowell:46-62.

EDMONTON AREA SERIES

NO.

1. Quality of Life in Edmonton: Initial Findings from the 1977 Edmonton Area Study (80-1829)
   Leslie W. Kennedy, Herbert C. Northcott and Cliff Kinzel. June 1977.

2. Public Opinion and the Swine 'Flu Immunization Program (80-1830)
   Herbert C. Northcott. September 1977.

*3. Environmental Opportunity and Social Contact: A True or Spurious Relationship?
   Leslie W. Kennedy. October 1977.

4. Attitudes Toward Crime and Law Enforcement: A Comparison of Canadian and American Data (80-1831)
   James H. Creechan, Timothy F. Hartnagel, Robert A. Silverman. January 1978.

5. The Perception and Fear of Crime: Implications for Neighbourhood Cohesion, Social Activity and Community Affect (80-1832)
   Timothy F. Hartnagel. February 1978.

*6. A Discriminant Analysis of the Social Status and Orientation Characteristics of Kin, Friend and Neighbour Social Networks (80-1833)
   Lyle E. Larson, Brenda Munro, Gordon Munro. July 1978.

7. Initial Findings from the 1978 Edmonton Area Study (80-1834)
   Leslie W. Kennedy, Clifford Kinzel, Herbert C. Northcott. July 1978.

*8. The Relative Importance of Work as a Factor in Life Satisfaction (80-1487)
   Terrence H. White. November 1978.

*9. Life Situation, Life Style, and Psychophysiological Health: Objective and Subjective Dimensions (80-1835)
   Herbert C. Northcott. February 1979.

10. The Nature of the Canadian Television Audience - A Case Study (80-1488)
   Nicholas G. Petryszak. October 1979.

11. Canada and the United States: A Comparison of Selected Attitudes Concerning Social Control and Individual Liberties (80-1489)
   Edward G. Grabb. November 1979.

12. Women, Work and Health (80-1490)
   Herbert C. Northcott. November 1979.

13. Social Interaction and the Desire to Move (80-1491)
   Leslie W. Kennedy. November 1979.

NO.

14. Selected Findings from the 1980 Edmonton Area Study
Herbert C. Northcott and Cliff Kinzel. July 1980.

15. Extended Family Support and the High Cost of Housing
L.W. Kennedy and Dennis W. Stokes. September 1980.

16. Government Influence, Media Influence, and Quitting Smoking
Herbert C. Northcott and George Jarvis. December 1980.

17. Social Relations in Changing Communities: A New Test of Old Theories
L.W. Kennedy and D.W. Stokes. January 1981.

18. Women, Work, Health, & Happiness
Herbert C. Northcott. February 1981.

19. Determinants of Reported Seatbelt Use: Traditional Masculinity, Age, Marital Status, and Alcohol Consumption
W. Andrew Harrell. April 1981.

20. Selected Findings from the 1981 Edmonton Area Study
Clifford Kinzel. August 1981.

21. Why Wives Work: The Relative Effects of Situational and Attitudinal Factors
Graham S. Lowe and Harvey Krahn. October 1981.

22. Selected Findings From the 1981 Winnipeg Area Study
Raymond Currie and Charlene Thacker. April 1982.

23. Ethnic Identification: Variations in Regional and National Preferences
Leo Driedger, Charrlene Thacker, and Raymond Currie. July 1982.

24. Community Influences on Attitudes Towards Unions
Harvey Krahn and Graham S. Lowe. August 1982.

25. 1982 Edmonton Area Study Summary Report
Cliff Kinzel. September 1982.

26. Deterring Physician Utilization: Medical Care User Fees in Canada.
Herbert C. Northcott and Earle L. Snider. February 1982.

27. Public Attitudes Towards Unions: Some Canadian Evidence.
Harvey Krahn and Graham S. Lowe. May 1983.

* Out of Print